The N.Y. Bar and Leftist Travel, P. 4

The Secretary of Defense Finally Admits Ike and Strauss Wrong on Dirty Bombs, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 30 AUGUST 4, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Answering A Reader's Challenge for Constructive Proposals

What Would You Do If You Were In Ike's Shoes?

If I were in Ike's shoes, I would prepare to recognize reality but I would ask a price for it. I would not leave the United States in the undignified position of being dragged reluctantly to the summit and left with no recourse but a retreat. I would take the initiative on lines big enough to catch the world's imagination.

I would propose to neutralize the Middle East, including Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, but only in return for the neutralization of Eastern Europe. I would offer to take all American troops and bases out of the Middle East if the Russians took their troops and bases out of Eastern Europe. I would propose that both areas then be opened to United Nations inspection. I would say, "we challenge you to turn the breeding places of war into a *cordon sanitaire* of peace."

When Nasser Spoke for All Mankind

I would offer to give up our methods of "indirect aggression" in Eastern Europe—CIA cloak-and-dagger activities, the various disguised "private" facilities like Radio Free Europe and the undercover emigre organizations. I would ask in return that the Soviet Union give up similar radio and undercover activities. This again should be made subject to UN surveillance through a special organism designed to enforce the end of the cold war. "We are sick of the cold war," Nasser said in a speech at Cairo the other day. In that Nasser spoke for most of the world. I would have America take the initiative in ending it.

I would propose that existing boundaries in the Middle East and Eastern Europe be recognized and guaranteed by both sides through the UN. Much injustice is inextricably involved in these boundaries but all this is minor compared to the danger of a thermonuclear war. This would mean recognition of Israel by the Arab States but I would propose to sweeten it for Nasser and the Arabs by recognizing another inescapable reality—the artificiality of Jordan, and proposing that Jordan be allowed to join Syria and Egypt in the United Arab Republic. I would insist on a regional neutrality pact by which the UAR in return would guarantee the existing boundaries of Lebanon and Israel. With this I would propose an international agency for the resettlement of the Arab refugees as part of a regional development plan under UN auspices.

Their Own Roads to Socialism

I would propose that the countries of the Middle East and East Europe, in return for their liberation from cold war and contending Great Power imperialisms, promise never to take part in combinations against either side or to give bases to either side. I would suggest to the Russians that they would be better off in such a context to let East Europe pursue its own road to socialism than to impose by rigid armed fist and terror a seeming stability which hid deep resentments bound some day to explode. I would assert as an American principle non-interference in the affairs of smaller countries by either side, and begin to show that I meant it in Latin America.

The Problem of The Divided

There remains the terrible question of the divided countries, East and West, the unresolved little civil wars which could easily erupt into mankind's own final civil holocaust. I would propose the neutralization of Germany, Vietnam and Korea in return for free elections under UN auspices to pick new regimes for all three. I would challenge the Soviets to relinquish Communist dictatorship in their portions of these divided lands, to allow genuine free choice, and to accept the results in return for guaranteed neutrality. I would offer in return recognition of China and relinquishment of Formosa. And I would ask India and Pakistan, similarly, to unite and free Kashmir and to give it autonomy, linked both to India and Pakistan, as a symbol and harbinger of that better day when all India may be united again.

In this vast band of in-between nations, there is much economic distress, largely due to the huge amount of national resources which poorer countries must divert to armament. I would propose a general step-by-step arms reduction in the neutralized zone to the level of internal police forces. I would say, invoking hallowed phrases and symbols all the world's people understand, "Let us beat the swords into plough-shares." In the framework of a world in which the poisons of so much inter-human hate would no longer fester, world agreement to end nuclear testing, and then to police nuclear production and then to outlaw nuclear war—or any other kind—would at last be feasible.

Why Not Annual Summit Meetings?

Finally I would invite Krushchev to come and visit our country and see for himself how unlike his preconceptions it is, and offer in return to visit Russia. And I would propose that summit meetings no longer be the febrile last resort of impending catastrophe but an annual institution, a get-together without agenda, without publicity and with no specific purpose other than to get to know each other better. Here it seems to me is a Grand Design worthy of America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite Delay and Double-Talk, Senator Anderson's Charges Are Confirmed

Defense Secretary Admits Ike and Strauss Wrong in Dirty Bomb Denials

When the Secretary of Defense admits that the President was misled and misleading on the subject of "dirty" bombs that should be news. But Secretary McElroy's letter of July 28 was so sloppily covered by the press that few readers must have realized what it was all about.

This is the background. On *Meet the Press* April 27, Senator Anderson (D., New Mex.), charged that despite talk of clean bombs our military were not only stockpiling dirty bombs but inserting something which makes them dirtier. This was denied by the President and by Strauss.

Anderson Suggests Russell Inquire

In a Senate speech on May 5, Senator Anderson suggested that the Armed Services Committee "ask the military." On May 13 Senator Russell, chairman of Armed Services, sent the Secretary of Defense a letter designed to establish the truth. The letter from McElroy is the result.

As the reader can see from the two boxes on this page, the McElroy letter shows Anderson was right. The Pentagon did its best to delay and disguise this damaging admission. Secretary McElroy tried to fob off Senator Russell with an oral explanation. Russell—who has had long experience with military bureaucrats—insisted that the Secretary put it in writing.

This seems to have taken a long time. McElroy's letter was dated July 11 and not released until July 28, more than two months after the original letter of inquiry. The Pentagon did not rely only on time lag. The letter is a model of bureaucratic double-talk. In the effort to befuddle the issue, it went far afield and adopted some novel nomenclature. But in the course of this it officially admitted we were tackling the problems involved in making not just one, but two kinds, of dirtier bombs.

The letter begins by dividing bombs into three classes. It calls the 100 percent dirty bomb, the pure fission bomb, the "normal weapon." It calls any bomb in which radioactivity has been minimized a "clean weapon." Then it discloses a third category, the "salted weapon," one to which (as in the cobalt bomb) other materials have been added to increase radioactivity beyond that of the 100% fission bomb. McElroy admits these are "dirty" bombs.

In addition—it takes the letter a long time to get to the point — "normal" bombs are taken out of stockpile and equipped with new fuzes in a way which sharply increases local fall-out. This confirms Anderson's charge.

One word more of explanation is required. McElroy insists with self-righteous indignation, that no "salted" weapons are under development and that stockpiling them is not "contemplated at this time." Possibly one reason for this is that no one has yet discovered how to produce what the military want. This is a bomb with a minimum of blast and fire and a maximum of radioactivity. This would destroy living things in any area and keep human beings temporarily out of it but would leave intact industrial or military facilities we would ourselves like to use.

This is the "humane" type of radioactive warfare advocated by Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence in the winter of '49-50. We leave you with it for your next nightmare.

How Strauss Lied

"They [the military] are not only stockpiling them [dirty bombs] but they have pulled bombs out of stockpile and inserted something which makes it dirtier."

—Senator Anderson, Meet the Press, April 27.

"The facts are that atomic bombs are only taken from stockpile for purposes of routine inspection or for modification or improvement. No material is 'inserted' in bombs for the purpose of increasing the amount of fission products or to add to the total fallout."

—Admiral Strauss, replying to Anderson, May 3.

"Q. Are there bombs which have been withdrawn from stockpile for certain modifications which are dirtier because of the modifications?

"A. If you refer to local fallout the answer is 'Yes.' . . ."

—July 11 Letter of Secretary of Defense McElroy answering questions put to him on May 13 by Senator Russell.

McElroy—Dirtier Bombs Have Been Under Study for 3 Years

"Now, no military officer that I know of has ever even suggested that we have dirtier bombs, certainly there has been no official suggestion of that kind."

—Pres. Eisenhower replying at press conference April 30 to Senator Anderson's charges of April 27.

"With reference to the question arising from the President's conference of April 30, 1958, I should like to make it clear that to the best of my knowledge no military officer holding any position of responsibility for the formulation of military policy has suggested that we have bombs designed to increase the amount of radioactivity. However, the possibility and technical feasibility of adding certain materials ("salting") to increase short-lived radioactivity have been under study for several years for two reasons:

"(1) We should like to know whether an enemy might design and use such weapons against us;

"(2) We should like to determine whether it is technically feasible to design atomic weapons in such a way as to create short-lived local radioactivity without, at the same time, causing a high degree of destruction from blast and thermal effects.

"We visualize certain situations under which it might be highly desirable to deny the enemy the use of certain facilities and/or areas for a limited period without causing wholesale destruction. . . .

"In the last paragraph of your letter you refer to a letter from the Secretary of Defense dated March 26, 1955. Inasmuch as our records do not contain a letter of that date, on this subject, I assume that you refer to a letter of March 5, 1955, which requested the Atomic Energy Commission to explore 'methods of both increasing and decreasing the radioactive yield of thermonuclear weapons'."

—Letter July 11 by Secretary of Defense McElroy replying to a letter of May 13 by Senator Russell seeking the facts in the controversy precipitated by Senator Anderson's charges on Meet the Press, April 27.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

White Dissenters Subpoenaed for Atlanta Sessions to Intimidate Integrationists

150 Southern Negro Leaders Protest Un-American Committee Hearings

Wherever white men struggle to deny colored men equal rights, whether in South Africa, Algeria or our own South, a common pattern appears. The fight to prevent other races from enjoying equality of rights ends by undermining the civil liberties of the dominant whites themselves. Police states shape up, Fascist ideologies and movements spread. Denial of justice to the black undermines freedom for the white.

No Place for Jefferson

The invasion of the South by the witch hunt committees, first Eastland's Senate Internal Security subcommittee and now the House Un-American Activities Committee, is in this pattern: a means of terrorizing white moderates and liberals, recalling the two decades before the Civil War when all anti-slavery views in the South were suppressed and an overt anti-Jeffersonianism created a philosophy congenial to a society dominated by a slave-holding minority. The South, where family, class and money have long been the basis of oligarchic rule, is in this sense "un-American," a Whig and racist survival in an America otherwise steadily more egalitarian. But this is not the kind of un-Americanism the Committee was scheduled to investigate July 29, 30 and 31 in its first Southern hearings, at Atlanta, Ga.

The new hearings, like Eastland's earlier incursions, are intended to frighten into conformity those few Southern whites who believe in integration and the larger minority who are ready to obey the law. So far as could be learned on the eve of the hearings (on which we hope to report fully in our next issue), no Negroes have been subpoenaed, only whites, among them Anne and Carl Braden (her book, *The Wall Between,* has just been published by Monthly Review Press, 66 Barrow St., NYC, $5, an account of the fight for racial equality that made them the central figures in Kentucky's famous sedition trial.) They have also subpoenaed Perry Cartwright and Gene Feldman, editors of the *Southern Newsletter,* and Frank Wilkinson, of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, who was served with a subpoena when he arrived in Atlanta last week as an observer.

Five Negro Editors In Protest

Among the signers of the Southern Negro protest against House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in the South were the distinguished sociologist, Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, Attorney Louis L. Redding of Delaware, the Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth of Alabama, and five Negro editors: L. C. Bates of the Little Rock, Ark., State Press; C. A. Scott of the Atlanta, Ga., Daily World; C. C. Dejoie, Jr., of the Louisiana Weekly; Carter Wesley of the Texas Informer; and Eddie L. Madison, Jr., of the Oklahoma Eagle.

A striking aspect of the new hearings is the release of a protest by 150 leading Southern Negroes to the House of Representatives. This was coordinated by the Southern Conference Educational Fund, 822 Perdido St., New Orleans, La., the last militant inter-racial group still operating in the South. We reprint the full text of this protest below, not only because it has been ignored by the press but also because it represents a new and heartening development. This is the first time in years a leading group of Negroes has recognized the close connection between their fight for civil rights and the fight of dissenting white elements against the witch hunt.

In the South the dissenting white is more isolated and helpless than the Negro; he has no community to sustain him; he is walled in between the contempt of white racists and the often equally racist distrust of the Negro whose rights he would champion. In this context, it was an act of courage and human solidarity for these Southern Negro leaders to risk the Committee's ire by a public protest.

The Kind of Un-American Activities in the South the Committee Won't Investigate

"We are informed that the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives is planning to hold hearings in Atlanta, Georgia, at an early date.

"As Negroes residing in Southern States and the District of Columbia, all deeply involved in the struggle to secure full and equal rights for our people, we are very much concerned by this development.

"We are acutely aware of the fact that there is at the present time a shocking amount of un-American activity in our Southern states. To cite only a few examples, there are the bombings of the homes, schools, and houses of worship of not only Negroes but also of our Jewish citizens; the terror against Negroes in Dawson, Ga.; the continued refusal of boards of registrars in many Southern communities to allow Negroes to register and vote; and the activities of White Citizens Councils encouraging open defiance of the U. S. Supreme Court.

"However, there is nothing in the record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to indicate that, if it comes South, it will investigate these things. On the contrary, all of its activities in recent years suggest that it is much more interested in harassing and labelling as 'subversive' any citizen who is inclined to be liberal or an independent thinker.

"For this reason, we are alarmed at the prospect of this committee coming South to follow the lead of Senator Eastland, as well as several state investigating committees, in trying to attach the 'subversive' label to any liberal white southerner who dares to raise his voice in support of our democratic ideals.

"It was recently pointed out by four Negro leaders who met with President Eisenhower that one of our great needs in the South is to build lines of communication between Negro and white Southerners. Many people in the South are seeking to do this. But if white people who support integration are labelled 'subversive' by congressional committees, terror is spread among white citizens and it becomes increasingly difficult to find white people who are willing to support our efforts for full citizenship. Southerners, white and Negro, who strive today for full democracy must work at best against tremendous odds. They need the support of every agency of our Federal government. It is unthinkable that they should instead be harassed by committees of the U. S. Congress.

"We therefore urge you to use your influence to see that the House Committee on Un-American Activities stays out of the South—unless it can be persuaded to come to our region to help defend us against those subversives who oppose our Supreme Court, our Federal policy of civil rights and our American ideals of equality and brotherhood."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Snail's Pace of Senate Hearings Killing Off Administration Hopes

Conservative Bar Report Opposes Passport Denials on Political Grounds

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the Administration's passport bill creep along at a reassuring snail's pace, and there will almost certainly be no legislation passed at this session. Until the hearing last Monday, those heard from have been the expected sources: liberal organizations like the ACLU, the ADA, the American Jewish Congress, the National Lawyer's Guild and the Federation of American Scientists, and lawyers like Harry Rand, who fought the case of the physicist Dayton to the Supreme Court.

Last Monday, however, the Senate committee heard from a fresh quarter—the Special Committee set up over a year ago by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York to study the passport problem. The eight are all staid practitioners, with not a crusader among them, headed by an attorney with the almost Dickensian name of Fifield Workum.

To Appear in Book Form

Mr. Workum's statement to the Senate committee embodied the gist of a book this special committee is soon to publish, and we believe it will make the enactment of the Administration bill next session more difficult. The Special Bar Committee comes up in favor of as little restriction as possible.

The Bar Association report shows the capacity of legal tradition to overcome political preconception. The eight men who worked on the report are all, so far as we know, conservatively politically. But they are also conservative lawyers and as such unable to stomach restriction of liberty on the basis of opinion.

The statement by Mr. Workum opposed denial of passports "solely on the basis of membership in any organization, even the Communist Party." They would limit denials on security grounds "to citizens as to whom the Secretary finds reasonable grounds to believe that their activities abroad would endanger the national security of the United States by (1) transmitting without proper authority, security information of the United States; (2) inciting hostilities or conflicts which might involve the United States; (3) inciting attacks by force upon the United States or attempts to overthrow its government by force and violence."

Should Leftists Be Free to Travel?

"Travel restrictions which have been imposed because of suspected leftist beliefs and associations do not, in the judgment of the Committee, serve the overall objectives of United States policy. If United States expressions of belief in principles of freedom are to be given credence among the nations of the world, the deed must suit the word."

—Statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, July 28, on behalf of the Special Committee on Passport Procedures, N. Y. Bar Assn.

The Bar Association committee believes that denial of passports should not rest on "the generalized taint which properly attaches to the Communist Party as an organization" but on "a clear showing of real danger to the nation which would follow from the travel abroad of the particular applicant." It sees in the kind of political standards applied by the State Department an "inevitable tendency . . . to deal with rumor as fact, association as membership and advocacy as incitement."

Split on Hearing Procedure

On the question of hearing procedure, the bar committee split, though only one member would permit the latitude the State Department asks in withholding "sensitive" information from the applicant. Two others would make an exception from normal due process but only where the applicant is a person who has had access to "highly classified" information. Another would in some cases allow a temporary withholding of passports for not more than six months.

Four members of the committee believe, however, that under any circumstances counsel for the applicant should be permitted to examine all documentary evidence, and to cross-examine all witnesses, including confidential informants. We look forward to the Committee's full report in book form as a bulwark against the erosion of traditional notions of fair trial under the impact of the cold war.

We'll Be Glad to Supply A Few Extra Copies Free for Friends You Meet on Vacation

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

8/4/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED